arXiv:math/0607072v3 [math.NT] 31 Jul 2007

A note on the paper by Bugeaud and Laurent ”Minoration effective de la distance p-adique entre puissances de nombres algébriques” [*][‡]

Tomohiro Yamada[§][¶]

February 8, 2008

Abstract

We shall make a slight improvement to a result of p-adic logarithms, which gives a nontrivial upper bound for the exponent of p dividing the Fermat quotient $x^{p-1} - 1$.

1 Introduction

In 1939, Gel'fond[3] established a result concerning upper bounds for p-adic distance between two integral powers. This result has been refined by several papers such as Schinzel[8], Yu[11, 12, 13, 14, 15], Bugeaud[2], and Bugeaud and Laurent[1]. Our purpose is to improve a result in the last paper by noting that constants $\gamma_j (j = 1, 2)$ in [1, Théorème 1] can be replaced by 1, which allows us to omit the condition $\log A_i \geq (\log p)/D$ in [1] by modifying some constants.

Theorem 1.1. *Denote a $(p-1)$-th root of unity in $\mathbf{Z}_p$ by ζ. Let p be a prime and α_1, α_2 be integers not divisible by p. Let m_i be integers satisfying $\alpha_i \equiv \zeta^{m_i} \pmod{p}$ for $i = 1, 2$ and g be an integer satisfying $\alpha_1^g \equiv \alpha_2^g \equiv 1 \pmod{p}$. Let $K \geq 3, L \geq 2$, R_1, R_2, S_1, S_2 be nonnegative integers. Put $R = R_1 + R_2 - 1, S = S_1 + S_2 - 1, N = KL$. Let b_1, b_2 be positive integers with $(b_1, b_2, p) = 1$ and denote*

$$b = \frac{(R-1)b_2 + (S-1)b_1}{2} \left(\prod_{k=1}^{K-1} k!\right)^{-2/(K^2-K)}.$$

Suppose there exist congruence classes c_1, c_2 modulo g such that

$$\begin{aligned} &\#\{\alpha_1^r \alpha_2^s \mid 0 \leq r < R_1, 0 \leq s < S_1, m_1 r + m_2 s \equiv c_1 \pmod{g}\} \\ &\geq L, \end{aligned} \tag{1}$$

---

[*] Keywords: p-adic logarithm, Fermat quotient.

[†] 2000 Mathematics Subject Classification: 11A05, 11A07, 11J86.

[‡] This paper is a revised version of my master thesis[10].

[§] Department of Mathematics, Kyoto University, Kyoto, 606-8502, Japan

[¶] e-mail: `tyamada@math.kyoto-u.ac.jp`

$$\begin{aligned}&\#\{b_2r+b_1s \mid 0\le r<R_2, 0\le s<S_2, m_1r+m_2s\equiv c_2 \pmod g\}\\ &\ge (K-1)L.\end{aligned} \tag{2}$$

If we have

$$K(L-1)\log p > 3\log N + (K-1)\log b + L((R-1)\log\alpha_1 + (S-1)\log\alpha_2), \tag{3}$$

then

$$v_p(\Lambda) \le KL-1. \tag{4}$$

A special case to which we can apply our version of Bugeaud-Laurent theorem is a problem of Fermat quotient. By a well-known theorem of Fermat, $x^{p-1}\equiv 1 \mod p$ for any prime p and integer x relatively prime to p. However, it is unknown whether there exist infinitely many prime p such that $x^{p-1}\equiv 1 \mod p^2$. It seems to be intersting and important to search for a nontrivial upper bound for the exponent of p dividing $x^{p-1}-1$. This is equivalent to give a nontrivial estimate for the p-adic logarithm $\log_p x^{p-1}$. But already known results for linear forms in p-adic logarithms do not give it. As for results of Bugeaud and Laurent[1], the condition $\log A_i \ge (\log p)/D$ renders the estimate trivial. But now we can overcome this obstacle using Theorem 1.1. Our result is as follows.

Theorem 1.2. *If p is a prime and x, y are relatively prime integers, then*

$$v_p(x^{p-1}-1) \le \left\lfloor 283(p-1)\frac{\log y}{\log p}\frac{\log xy}{\log p}\right\rfloor + 4. \tag{5}$$

If q is odd prime, then we have

$$v_p(q^{p-1}-1) \le \left\lfloor 283(p-1)\frac{\log 2}{\log p}\frac{\log 2q}{\log p}\right\rfloor + 4. \tag{6}$$

Moreover, we have

$$v_p(2^{p-1}-1) \le \left\lfloor 283(p-1)\frac{\log 3}{\log p}\frac{\log 6}{\log p}\right\rfloor + 4 \tag{7}$$

Our argument is essentially the same as the argument of Bugeaud and Laurent[1]. Indeed, all that we need is to make a very slight change in this paper.

Though this result is nontrivial, this seems to be far from best possible. Ridout[7] shows that there are only finitely many rational integers x such that $v_p(x^{p-1}-1)\ge(1+\epsilon)(\log x)/(\log p)$ for any fixed prime p and positive ϵ. It is conjectured that $v_p(x^{p-1}-1)\ge 3$ occurs only finitely many times for any fixed integer $x>1$.

The abc conjecture implies that for any $\epsilon>0$, the inequality $v_p(x^{p-1}-1)\ge 1+(1+\epsilon p)(\log x)/(\log p)$ occurs only finitely many times. We can even conjecture:

Conjecture 1.3. The inequality

$$v_p(x^{p-1}-1) \leq 2 + \frac{\log x + 2\log\log x + \log\log p}{\log p} \tag{8}$$

holds for any integer $x > 1$ and prime p except finitely many pairs (x, p). Furthermore, the inequality

$$v_p(q^{p-1}-1) \leq 2 + \frac{\log q + \log\log q + \log\log p}{\log p} \tag{9}$$

holds for any primes (q, p) except finitely many pairs (q, p).

We have a heuristic argument. Since$(x+p)^{p-1} \equiv x^{p-1} - p \pmod{p^2}$, we see that for any integer x_0 not divisible by p, the values $(x^{p-1}-1)/p \pmod{p^{e-1}} (0 \leq x < p^e - 1, x \equiv x_0 \pmod{p})$ take each congruent class exactly once. Hence it is reasonable to assume the probability of $x^{p-1} \equiv 1 \pmod{p^e}$ is p^{-e+1}. Let $e(x, p)$ be a function defined over nonnegative integers x and primes p. If $\sum_{x,p} p^{-e(x,p)+1}$ converges, then we can expect that $v_p(x^{p-1}-1) \geq e(x, p)$ has only finitely many solutions in (x, p).

We can choose

$$e(x, p) = 2 + \frac{\log x + 2\log\log x + \log\log p}{\log p}. \tag{10}$$

Then we see that

$$\sum_{x,p} p^{-e(x,p)+1} \leq \sum_{x,p} (p\log p)^{-1}(x\log^2 x)^{-1} = \sum_{p} (p\log p)^{-1} \sum_{x} (x\log^2 x)^{-1} \tag{11}$$

and therefore the sum converges.

One of our purposes of obtaining an upper bound for the exponent of p dividing $x^{p-1}-1$ is an application for the study of problems involving the sum-of-divisors function.

Nagell[4, Theorems 94, 95] gives that $v_p(\sigma(q^c)) \leq v_p(q^{p-1}-1) + v_p(c+1)$ for distinct primes p, q with $q \neq 2$ and a positive integer c. Now Theorem 1.2 immidiately gives the following theorem.

Theorem 1.4. *If q is an odd prime, then we have*

$$v_p(\sigma(q^c)) \leq v_p(c+1) + \left\lfloor 283(p-1)\frac{\log 2}{\log p}\frac{\log 2q}{\log p} \right\rfloor + 4. \tag{12}$$

Moreover, we have

$$v_p(\sigma(2^c)) \leq v_p(c+1) + \left\lfloor 283(p-1)\frac{\log 3}{\log p}\frac{\log 6}{\log p} \right\rfloor + 4. \tag{13}$$

If we assume Conjecture 1.3, we have

$$v_p(\sigma(q^c)) \leq v_p(c+1) + 2 + \frac{\log q + \log\log q + \log\log p}{\log p} \tag{14}$$

except only finitely many pairs (p, q).

We exhibit an application to the problem of perfect numbers. If $N = \prod_{i=1}^{k} p_i^{e_i}$ is a perfect number with $p_1 < \cdots < p_i$ distinct primes, then $e_i \leq (p_k - 1)/2$ by a well-known result of primitive prime factors. Hence $N < (\prod_i p_i)^{(p_k-1)/2}$(for other finiteness results, see, for example, [5], [6], [9]). We can improve this upper bound using Theorem 1.4.

Theorem 1.5. *If* $\sigma(N) = \alpha N$ *with* $\alpha = n/d$ *and* $N = \prod_{i=1}^{k} p_i^{e_i}$ *with* $p_1 < \cdots < p_i$ *distinct primes, then*

$$N \leq d^C \prod_{i=1}^{k-1} p_i^{C(k-1)(p_k-1)/\log p_k} p_k^{C(k-1)(p_{k-1}-1)/\log p_{k-1}} \tag{15}$$

for some absolute constant C*. Furthermore, if Conjecture 1.3 is true, then*

$$N < \max\left\{ e^{k^2}, d^{e/(e-2)} k^{-ke/(e-2)} (\prod_i p_i)^{kC'} \right\} \tag{16}$$

for some absolute constant C'*.*

We hope that our method will provide some systematical method to study arithmetic functions involving divisors.

2 Proof of Theorem 1.1

We begin by improving [1, Lemme 10]; we shall show that the term g in the error terms can be omitted.

Lemma 2.1. *Let* K, L, R, S, g *be integers* ≥ 1*,* m_1, m_2, c *rational integers with* $(m_1, m_2, g) = 1$*. Write* $N = KL$ *and* $l_j = \lfloor (j-1)/K \rfloor$ $(j = 1, \cdots, N)$*. If* $(r_j, s_j)(j = 1, \cdots, N)$ *are* N *pairs of integers satisfying*

$$\begin{aligned} 0 \leq r_v \leq R-1, 0 \leq s_v \leq S-1, \\ m_1 r_v + m_2 s_v \equiv c \pmod{g} \end{aligned} \tag{17}$$

for $j = 1, \cdots, N$*, then*

$$\begin{aligned} M_1 - G_1 \leq \sum_{j=1}^{N} l_j r_j \leq M_1 + G_1, \\ M_2 - G_2 \leq \sum_{j=1}^{N} l_j s_j \leq M_2 + G_2, \end{aligned} \tag{18}$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} M_1 = \frac{(L-1)(r_1 + \cdots + r_N)}{2}, G_1 = \frac{NL(R-1)}{4}, \\ M_2 = \frac{(L-1)(s_1 + \cdots + s_N)}{2}, G_1 = \frac{NL(S-1)}{4}. \end{aligned} \tag{19}$$

Proof. We shall only show the inequality concerning $\sum_{j=1}^{N} l_j r_j$. The other inequality can be easily shown in a similar way. Write $g' = (m_2, g)$ and $g'' = g/g'$.

If $R \geq g'$, then we can proceed as in the original lemma and our lemma follows observing that $R + g' - 1 \leq 2(R - 1)$.

If $R < g'$, then all r_j must be equal to c' in the original lemma. Hence we have

$$\sum_{j=1}^{N} l_j r_j = c' \sum_{j=1}^{N} l_j = c' N(L-1)/2 = (r_1 + \cdots + r_N)(L-1)/2 = M_1.$$

This proves the lemma. □

In [1, Lemme 11], we can replace $\gamma_j (j = 1, 2)$ by one. This proves Theorem 1.1.

3 Proof of Theorem 1.2

We write $a_i = (\log A_i)/(\log p)$ and choose real constants B, k, l satisfying $B \geq (\log b)/(\log p)$, $k, l > 0$, and

$$k \lfloor lB + 1 \rfloor \lfloor lB + 2 \rfloor - k \lfloor lB + 2 \rfloor B \geq T_1 + T_2 + T_3, \tag{20}$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} T_1 &= 2 \lfloor lB + 2 \rfloor^2 \sqrt{k}, \\ T_2 &= 2 \lfloor lB + 2 \rfloor^{3/2} (g a_1 a_2)^{-1/2}, \\ T_3 &= \frac{3 \log(g a_1 a_2 k \lfloor lB + 2 \rfloor^2 + \lfloor lB + 2 \rfloor)}{g a_1 a_2 \log p}. \end{aligned}$$

We set L, K, R_1, R_2, S_1, S_2 as follows:

$$\begin{gathered} L = \lfloor lB \rfloor + 2, K = \lfloor kgLa_1a_2 \rfloor + 1, \\ R_1 = \left\lfloor \sqrt{gLa_2/a_1} \right\rfloor + 1, S_1 = \left\lfloor \sqrt{gLa_1/a_2} \right\rfloor + 1, \\ R_2 = \left\lfloor \sqrt{g(K-1)La_2/a_1} \right\rfloor + 1, S_2 = \left\lfloor \sqrt{g(K-1)La_1/a_2} \right\rfloor + 1, \\ b = \frac{g(R+S-2)}{2} \left(\prod_{k=1}^{K-1} k! \right)^{-2/(K^2-K)}. \end{gathered} \tag{21}$$

Proceeding as in [1, Section 6], we find that if the condition

$$\begin{aligned} &\#\{b_2 r + b_1 s \mid 0 \leq r < R_2, 0 \leq s < S_2, m_1 r + m_2 s \equiv c \pmod{g}\} \\ =&\#\{(r, s) \mid 0 \leq r < R_2, 0 \leq s < S_2, m_1 r + m_2 s \equiv c \pmod{g}\}. \end{aligned} \tag{22}$$

holds, then we have $v(\Lambda) < N$.

To prove Theorem 1.2, we apply this with $g = b_1 = b_2 = p - 1$, $\alpha_1 = q$, $\alpha_2 = 2, 3$ according to whether p is odd or not, and each $m_i (i = 1, 2)$ being an integer satisfying $\alpha_i \equiv \zeta^{m_i} \pmod{p}$. We may assume that $p > 2^{283}$, since otherwise the theorem follows from the trivial estimate. We begin by confirming that the choice $(k, l, B) = (11.32, 3, 1.027)$ satisfies (20).

Now $K = \lfloor 56.6 g a_1 a_2 \rfloor + 1 > 2^{100}$ and $\epsilon(K)$ in [1, Lemme 13] is smaller than 10^{-30}. Hence

$$\begin{aligned} \log b &\leq \log g + \log(\frac{1}{a_1} + \frac{1}{a_2}) + \frac{3}{2} - \log 2 - \frac{1}{2} \log k + \epsilon(K) \\ &\leq \log p + \log\log p < (1.027) \log p, \end{aligned} \tag{23}$$

which assures that the choice $B = 1.027$ satisfies the condition $B \geq (\log b)/(\log p)$. Since $N = \lfloor 283 g a_1 a_2 \rfloor + 5$, we succeeded to prove (5) under the condition (22).

If the condition (22) fails, then there exist rational integers c_0, c_1 such that the congruence $m_1 r + m_2 s \equiv c_0 \pmod{g}$ has two solutions (r_1, s_1) and (r_2, s_2) in integers $0 \leq r < R_2, 0 \leq s < S_2$ satisfying $r_i - s_i = c_1$. We have $r_2 - r_1 = s_2 - s_1$ and therefore

$$(m_1 - m_2)(r_1 - r_2) \equiv m_1(r_1 - r_2) + m_2(s_1 - s_2) \equiv 0 \pmod{g}. \tag{24}$$

Let $m_0 = m_1 - m_2$ and g_0 be the residual order of $q \pmod{p}$. We can easily see that g_0 divides $r_1 - r_2$ since $\gcd(m_1 - m_2, g) = \gcd(m_0, g) = g/g_0$. Hence $R_2 > \max\{r_1, r_2\} \geq g_0$. Now (5) follows from the trivial estimate

$$v(Lm) \leq g_0 \frac{\log q}{\log p} \leq (R_2 - 1) \frac{\log q}{\log p} \leq g L a_2 \log q \log p = 5 g a_1 a_2. \tag{25}$$

(6) and (7) immidiately follow from (5) by taking (x, y) as $(2, q)$ and $(3, 2)$ respectively. This completes the proof.

4 Proof of Theorem 1.5

In this section, we denote by $C_1, C_2, \cdots$ absolute constants.

By Theorem 1.4, we have

$$v_{p_j}(\sigma(p_i^{e_i})) \leq v_{p_j}(e_i + 1) + 283(p_j - 1) \frac{\log 2}{\log p_j} \frac{\log 2p_i}{\log p_j} + 4 \tag{26}$$

if p_i is odd. Moreover, we have

$$v_{p_j}(\sigma(2^{e_i})) \leq v_{p_j}(e_i + 1) + 283(p_j - 1) \frac{\log 3}{\log p_j} \frac{\log 6}{\log p_j} + 4. \tag{27}$$

Thus we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} v_{p_j}(\alpha N) \leq v_{p_j}(&\prod_{i \neq j} (e_i + 1)) \\ &+ 283 \frac{p_j - 1}{(\log p_j)^2} (\sum_{p_i = 2} \log 3 \log 6 + \log 2 \sum_{i \neq j, p_i > 2} \log 2p_i) \\ &+ 4(k - 1). \end{aligned} \tag{28}$$

Noting that N divides $d\alpha N$ and N is composed of $p_i (1 \le i \le k)$, we see

$$\begin{aligned} N &\le d \prod_{i=1}^{k} (e_i + 1) \prod_{p_i = 2} 6^{4(k-1) + (283 \log 3) \sum_{p_j > 2} (p_j - 1)/\log p_j} \\ &\quad \times \prod_{p_i > 2} (2p_i)^{4(k-1) + (283 \log 2) \sum_{j \ne i} (p_j - 1)/\log p_j}. \end{aligned} \tag{29}$$

Since $\prod_{i=1}^{k} (e_i + 1) = d(N) = N^{o(1)}$, we have

$$N \le d^{C_1} \prod_{i=1}^{k-1} p_i^{C_1 (k-1)(p_k - 1)/\log p_k} p_k^{C_1 (k-1)(p_{k-1} - 1)/\log p_{k-1}}. \tag{30}$$

This proves (15).

We assume Conjecture 1.3. Theorem 1.4 gives

$$v_{p_j}(\sigma(p_i^{e_i})) \le v_{p_j}(e_i + 1) + \max\{2 + \frac{\log p_i + \log\log p_i + \log\log p_j}{\log p_j}, C_2\} \tag{31}$$

for any i, j. A similar argument to the first case, we have

$$\begin{aligned} N &\le d \prod_{i=1}^{k} (e_i + 1) \prod_{1 \le i, j \le k, i \ne j} \max\{p_i (\log p_i) p_j^2 (\log p_j), p_j^{C_2}\} \\ &\le d \prod_{i=1}^{k} (e_i + 1) \prod_{1 \le i, j \le k, i \ne j} p_i (\log p_i) p_j^{C_2} (\log p_j) \\ &\le d \prod_{i=1}^{k} (e_i + 1) p_i^{(C_2 + 1)(k-1)} (\log p_i)^{2(k-1)} \\ &\le d \prod_{i=1}^{k} (e_i + 1) p_i^{C_3 (k-1)}. \end{aligned} \tag{32}$$

Let $E = \sum (e_i + 1) \log p_i$. Then, since

$$\prod_{i=1}^{k} p_i^{e_i - C_3 (k-1)} \le d \prod_{i=1}^{k} (e_i + 1) \tag{33}$$

by (32), we have

$$\prod_{i=1}^{k} (\log p_i) p_i^{e_i + 1 - kC_4} \le d \prod_{i=1}^{k} (e_i + 1) \log p_i \le d (E/k)^k. \tag{34}$$

Taking the logarithms of both sides, we have

$$E \le k \log E - k \log k + \log d + kC_4 \sum_i \log p_i. \tag{35}$$

We observe that $x \geq k^2$ implies $k(\log x)/x \leq 2(\log k)/k \leq 2/e$. Hence

$$E \leq \max\left\{k^2, \frac{e}{e-2}(\log d - k\log k + kC_4\sum_i \log p_i)\right\}. \tag{36}$$

Since $N = \prod_i p_i^{e_i} < e^E$, we have

$$N < \max\left\{e^{k^2}, d^{e/(e-2)}k^{-ke/(e-2)}(\prod_i p_i)^{kC_5}\right\}. \tag{37}$$

This completes the proof.

References

[1] Y. Bugeaud and M. Laurent, Minoration effective de la distance p-adique entre puissances de nombres algébriques, *J. Number Theory* **61**(1996), 311–342.

[2] Y. Bugeaud, Linear forms in p-adic logarithms and the Diophantine equation $(x^n-1)/(x-1) = y^q$, *Math. Proc. Cambridge Phil. Soc.* **127**(1999), 373–381.

[3] A. O. Gel'fond, Sur la divisibilité de la difference des puissances de deux nombres entiers par une puissance d'un idéal premier, *Mat. Sb.* **7**(1940), 7–25.

[4] T. Nagell, *Introduction to Number Theory*, Second edition, Chelsea, New York, 1964.

[5] Pace P. Nielsen, *An upper bound for odd perfect numbers*, *Integers* **3** (2003), #A14.

[6] C. Pomerance, Multiply perfect numbers, Mersenne primes and effective computability, *Math. Ann.* **226** (1977), 195–206.

[7] D. Ridout, Rational approximations to algebraic numbers, *Mathematika* **4**(1957), 125–131.

[8] A. Schinzel, On two theorems of Gel'fond and some of their applications, *Acta Arith.*, **13**(1967), 177–236.

[9] T. Yamada, Odd perfect numbers of a special form, *Colloq. Math.*, **103**(2005), 303–307.

[10] T. Yamada, On Wieferich primes and p-adic logarithms, Master Thesis, Kyoto University, Kyoto, Japan, 2006.

[11] K. R. Yu, Linear forms in p-adic logarithms, *Acta Arith.*, **53**(1989), 107–186.

[12] K. R. Yu, Linear forms in p-adic logarithms, *Compos. Math.*, **74**(1990), 15–113.

[13] K. R. Yu, Linear forms in p-adic logarithms, *Compos. Math.*, **91**(1994), 241–276.

[14] K. R. Yu, Linear forms in p-adic logarithms and group varieties I, *J. reine angew. Math.*, **502**(1998), 29–92.

[15] K. R. Yu, Linear forms in p-adic logarithms and group varieties II, *Acta Arith.*, **89**(1999), 337–378.